

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Alexander C. Ranous et al.

Serial No.: 09/560,032

Filed: April 27, 2000

Docket No.: 10002142-1

Title: INTERNET USAGE DATA RECORDING SYSTEM AND METHOD EMPLOYING A
CONFIGURABLE RULE ENGINE FOR THE PROCESSING AND CORRELATION OF NETWORK
DATA

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed May 29, 2003. Claims 1-29 were rejected. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Specification

Applicant notes the Examiner's remarks regarding the use of the trademark Java in this Application. The mark is capitalized when it appears in the application. Applicant believes that the mark is used properly throughout the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 1-11 and 13-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,251 issued to Bullard et al. (hereinafter Bullard). Applicant submits that the Bullard reference fails to disclose the invention of independent claims 1, 13, 17, 20 and 26.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for recording network usage. The method comprises defining a network data collector including an encapsulator, an aggregator, and a data storage system. A set of network accounting data is received via the encapsulator. A network accounting data set is converted to a standard data format. The network accounting data set is processed via the aggregator, including defining a rule chain and applying the rule chain to the network accounting data set to construct an aggregation tree including creating an aggregated network accounting data set. The aggregated network accounting data set is stored in the data storage system.

Bullard discloses a system for enhancement of network accounting records. The system includes a data collector layer 18 that is a distributed layer of individual data collectors. The data collectors collect raw accounting information and convert data into normalized records referred to as network accounting records (NARs). Each of the data collectors forwards network accounting records to a flow aggregation process 60. (See

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Alexander C. Ranous et al.

Serial No.: 09/560,032

Filed: April 27, 2000

Docket No.: 10002142-1

Title: INTERNET USAGE DATA RECORDING SYSTEM AND METHOD EMPLOYING A CONFIGURABLE RULE ENGINE FOR THE PROCESSING AND CORRELATION OF NETWORK DATA

column 3, lines 43-54). The flow aggregation process 60, including aggregation processor 13, is a central collection point for all network accounting records produced from various data collectors in the data collection layer 18. The flow aggregation processor 60 aggregates and/or enhances record data across the network devices to produce summary NARs' (column 4, lines 1-26), and (column 18, lines 39-49). The data can be further enhanced and/or reduced (i.e., aggregated) to meet the specific needs of an application or output interface based on the aggregation policy of the flow data processor 60.

Bullard fails to disclose **defining a network data collector including an encapsulator, an aggregator, and a data storage system, where a network accounting data set is processed at the network data collector via the aggregator, including defining a rule chain and applying the rule chain to the network accounting data set to construct and aggregation tree including creating an aggregated network accounting data set.** In contrast, Bullard discloses individual data collectors that collect data and convert data into NARs. The NARs are forwarded to a central flow aggregation processor 13, not part of the data collectors. Although Bullard states that "individual data collectors 52a-52g can aggregate accounting records from individual data sources" (Col. 4, lines 24, 25), Bullard fails to disclose an aggregation process at each collector that applies a rule chain and constructs an aggregation tree as claimed by Applicant.

Bullard does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations. The method for recording network usage of independent claim 1 is not disclosed in Bullard. Applicants respectfully submit that the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-12 depend directly or indirectly upon independent claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claims 2-8 are also allowable over the art of record.

Bullard also does not teach or suggest the claimed recitations in independent claim 13. Claim 13 recites a method for recording network usage including correlating of network usage information and network session information. The method includes defining a network data correlator collector including an encapsulator, an aggregator, and a data storage system. A set of network session data is received via the encapsulator. The network session data set is processed via the aggregator, including the steps of defining a first rule chain and applying the first rule chain to the network session data to construct an aggregation tree. A set of

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Alexander C. Ranous et al.

Serial No.: 09/560,032

Filed: April 27, 2000

Docket No.: 10002142-1

Title: INTERNET USAGE DATA RECORDING SYSTEM AND METHOD EMPLOYING A CONFIGURABLE RULE ENGINE FOR THE PROCESSING AND CORRELATION OF NETWORK DATA

network usage data is received via the encapsulator. The network usage data set is processed via the aggregator, including the steps of defining a second rule chain and applying the second rule chain to the network usage data and the aggregation tree to construct a correlated aggregation tree. A correlated data set is determined from the correlated aggregation tree. The correlated data set is stored in the data storage system. Bullard does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations.

Bullard fails to define a **network data correlator collector that includes an encapsulator, an aggregator, and a data storage system**. Bullard further fails to recite **processing a network session data set via the aggregator, including the steps of defining a first rule chain and applying the first rule chain to the network session data to construct an aggregation tree, and processing a network usage data set via the aggregator including defining a second rule chain and applying the second rule chain to the network usage data and the aggregation tree to construct a correlated aggregation tree**. Bullard merely teaches that a number of fields can be captured in a NAR, which in turn can be combined and used to form a summary NAR. (See column 8, table 1).

Dependent claims 14-16 depend directly or indirectly upon independent claim 13. Accordingly, dependent claims 14-16 are also allowable over the art of record.

Bullard also does not teach or suggest the claim recitations in independent claim 17. Claim 17 recites a method for recording network usage. The method includes defining a first network data collector including a first encapsulator, a first aggregator, and a first data storage system. A first set of network data is received via the first encapsulator. The first network data set is processed via the first aggregator, including the steps of defining an aggregation rule chain in determining a first set of aggregated data by applying the aggregation rule chain to the first set of network data. The first aggregated network data set is stored in the first data storage system. Bullard does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations. Applicant respectfully submits that the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 18 and 23 depend directly or indirectly upon independent claim 17. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Alexander C. Ranous et al.

Serial No.: 09/560,032

Filed: April 27, 2000

Docket No.: 10002142-1

Title: INTERNET USAGE DATA RECORDING SYSTEM AND METHOD EMPLOYING A
CONFIGURABLE RULE ENGINE FOR THE PROCESSING AND CORRELATION OF NETWORK
DATA

Bullard also does not teach or suggest the claimed recitations in independent claim 24. Claim 24 recites a network usage recording system having a network data collector. The network data collector includes an encapsulator for receiving a set of network accounting data and converting the network accounting data set to a standard data format. An aggregator processes the network accounting data set, the aggregator including a defined rule chain, wherein the aggregator applies the rule chain to the network accounting data set to construct an aggregation tree, and determines a set of aggregated network accounting data from the aggregation tree. A data storage system stores the aggregated network accounting data. Bullard does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations. Applicant respectfully submits that the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 25 depends directly upon independent claim 24. Accordingly, this dependent claim is allowable over the art of record.

Bullard also does not teach or suggest the claimed recitations in independent claim 26. Claim 26 recites a network usage recording system having a network data correlator collector. The network data correlator collector includes an encapsulator which receives a set of network session data. An aggregator for processing the network session data set, the aggregator including a defined first rule chain wherein the aggregator applies the first rule chain to the network session data set to construct an aggregation tree. The encapsulator receives a set of network usage data, and the aggregator processes the network usage data set, the aggregator including a defined second rule chain, wherein the aggregator applies the second rule chain to the network usage data set and the aggregation tree to construct a correlated aggregation tree, and determines a correlated data set from the correlated aggregation tree. A data storage system stores the correlated data set. Bullard does not teach or suggest these claimed recitations. Applicant respectfully submits that the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 27-29 depend either directly or indirectly upon independent claim 26. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable over the art of record.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Alexander C. Ranous et al.

Serial No.: 09/560,032

Filed: April 27, 2000

Docket No.: 10002142-1

Title: INTERNET USAGE DATA RECORDING SYSTEM AND METHOD EMPLOYING A
CONFIGURABLE RULE ENGINE FOR THE PROCESSING AND CORRELATION OF NETWORK
DATA

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bullard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195 issued to Goodwin et al. Dependent claim 12 depends directly upon independent claim 1. Accordingly, dependent claim 12 is also allowable over the art of record.

Added Claims

With this Response claims 30 and 31 have been added. Claims 30 and 31 are directed to a method for recording network usage. No new matter has been added. Applicant believes claims 30 and 31 to be allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant believes independent claims 1, 13, 17, 20 and 26 and the claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. (281) 514-8236, Facsimile No. (281) 514-8332 or Steven E. Dicke at Telephone No. (612) 573-2002, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Alexander C. Ranous et al.

Serial No.: 09/560,032

Filed: April 27, 2000

Docket No.: 10002142-1

Title: INTERNET USAGE DATA RECORDING SYSTEM AND METHOD EMPLOYING A
CONFIGURABLE RULE ENGINE FOR THE PROCESSING AND CORRELATION OF NETWORK
DATA

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander C. Ranous et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-2002

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: August 29, 2003
SED:jan

Steven E. Dicke
Steven E. Dicke
Reg. No. 38,431

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 29 day of August, 2003.

By Steven E. Dicke
Name: Steven E. Dicke